

REMARKS

Responsive to the outstanding Office Action, applicant has carefully studied the Examiner's rejections. Claims 24-38, 40 and 23-44 have been amended herein. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added to the claims. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the following detailed arguments is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §112, first paragraph

Claims 24-44 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that the claims contained material not described in the specification in a manner to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

In response thereto, applicants respectfully submit that the specification does enable the present invention, as claimed herein.

A typical definition for one skilled in the art of the hydraulic diameter would be the hydraulic diameter as the fraction of "the fourfold value of the cross sectional area" by "the wetted perimeter of the cross section" of the tube under consideration.

Accordingly, for measuring the hydraulic diameter of a tube, the cross sectional area and the wetted perimeter of a tube in cross-flow must be determined. The wetted perimeter is seen as the inner cross surface line of the tube, which directly comes in contact with the through-flowing fluid. This serves to equalize the calculation of the flowing properties of fluids through tubes of both circular and non-circular cross sections.

Thus the term "four fold area" should explain the term "four fold value of the cross sectional area" sufficiently, with regard to a tube, for one skilled in the art to understand what is meant as used in context of the specification of the present invention. This also applies with regard to a tube with a through flowing fluid or liquid, where a "circumferential length of the cross section of free flow" should be understood in the same manner as the definition above.

It is therefore believed that the claims fully comply with the requirements of 35 USC §112, first paragraph, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §112, second paragraph

Claims 24-44 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness.

The Examiner notes that the term “device” used in the dependent claims lacks antecedent basis. In response thereto, the term “device” has been removed from the claims where it was present and the term “microreactor” has been used in its place.

In claim 26, the language has been corrected to properly depend from claim 24.

In claim 42, “the synthesis process” has been replaced with “a” synthesis process to properly provided basis for this term.

In claim 24, the term “whereby was removed”.

With regard to the terms “the four-fold area” and “the circumferential length of the cross section of free flow”, these terms are addressed above with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

With regard to claim 40, this claim has been amended to depend from process claim 38 therefore properly providing antecedent basis for “process”.

It is therefore believed that the claims fully comply with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

SUMMARY

It is believe that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to modify the application in any way, applicant's attorney suggests a telephone interview in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/S/Mark A Hixon
Mark A. Hixon
Registration No. 44,766

ATTORNEYS
Marshall & Melhorn, LLC
Four SeaGate - 8th Floor
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 249-7114
(419) 249-5171 Facsimile